

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/932,371	08/17/2001	Thomas Mazzone	11323.0007	4863

7590 08/04/2004

R. Kent Roberts
Hodgson Russ LLP
Suite 2000
One M&T Plaza
Buffalo, NY 14203-2391

EXAMINER

BELL, MELTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/932,371

Applicant(s)

MAZZONE, THOMAS

Examiner

Meltin Bell

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 May 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application **09/932,371** filed 8/17/01 as well as the Drawing Corrections, Oath and Amendment all filed 5/14/04. Claims 1-52 filed by the applicant have been entered and examined. An action on the merits of claims 1-52 appears below.

Priority

Applicant's claims for domestic priority against application numbers 60/226,401 filed **8/18/00** and 60/279,870 filed 3/29/01 under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claim (e.g. "database", "descriptions", "password", "code", "pair") raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea that is not tied to a technological art, environment or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. For example, if claim 13 was amended to recite a computer-implemented method, it will be

Art Unit: 2121

statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103(a)

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 8-16, 19-31, 34-41 and 44-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over *Feinberg* USPN 6,082,776 "Storing personal medical information" (Issued July 4, 2000, Filed May 7, 1997) in view of *Newton et al* USPN 5,771,291 "User identification and authentication system using ultra long identification keys and ultra large databases of identification keys for secure remote terminal access to a host computer" (June 23, 1998).

Regarding claim 1:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the each associated pair comprising an associated access code, which is associated with the patient, and an associated password, which is associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code, which is associated with a patient, and a prospective password, which is associated with a user of the system (Fig. 2, item 54; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- a second computer, in communication with the database and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 5, items

Art Unit: 2121

52, 54; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step ... encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* for the purpose of improving security.

Regarding claims 2-5, 8-12:

Claims 2-5 and 8-12 are rejected for being dependent on the above rejected independent claim 1 and for reasons given in the prior office action.

Regarding claim 13:

Feinberg teaches,

- providing a computer database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the each associated pair comprising an

Art Unit: 2121

associated access code, which is associated with the patient, and an associated password, which is associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code, which is associated with a patient, and a prospective password, which is associated with a user of the system (Fig. 2, item 54; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs; if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs while *Newton et al* teaches,

Art Unit: 2121

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* for the purpose of improving security.

Regarding claims 14-16, 19-23:

Claims 14-16 and 19-23 are rejected for being dependent on the above rejected independent claim 13 and for reasons given in the prior office action.

Regarding claim 24:

Feinberg teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to determine whether a prospective pair is among a group of associated pairs, each associated pair having (a) an access code which is associated with a patient corresponding to the medical information, and (b) a password associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 58; Fig. 5, item 52; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program... the card code"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The

Art Unit: 2121

medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- a computer readable program code module to provide medical information corresponding to the prospective pair, if the prospective pair is among the group of associated pairs (Fig. 2, items 11, 38, 58; Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is among the group of associated pairs while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is among the group of associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Motivation – The portions of the claimed article of manufacture would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ... to be readily employed")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* for the purpose of improving security.

Regarding claim 28:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2,

Art Unit: 2121

lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code, wherein acceptable passwords corresponding to users of the system, and wherein at least one of the acceptable passwords corresponds to an entity other than the patient (Fig. 2, item 10; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 6-12, "The computer system ... of the data"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")

- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether of the associated the prospective access code corresponds to one access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 5, items 52, 54; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

Art Unit: 2121

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* for the purpose of improving security.

Regarding claims 29-31, 34-38:

Claims 29-31 and 34-38 are rejected for being dependent on the above rejected independent claim 28 and for reasons given in the prior office action.

Regarding claim 36:

The rejection of claim 36 is similar to that for claim 28 as recited above since the stated limitations of the claim are set forth in the reference(s). Claim 36's limitations difference is taught in *Feinberg*:

- one of the associated access codes is issued to a health care provider, and the one of the associated access codes is related to a plurality of descriptions (Figs. 2, 6, 11A-B;

Art Unit: 2121

column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5")

Newton et al:

- the one of the associated access codes is related to a plurality of descriptions (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 35-51, "The initial step...or base computer")

Regarding claim 39:

Feinberg teaches,

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code, wherein the associated access code corresponds to the patient (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 6-12, "The computer system ... of the data"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
- providing a password (Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")

Art Unit: 2121

- determining whether the password is among a group of acceptable passwords, at least one of the passwords being associated with an entity other than the patient (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5")
 - providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
 - determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Figs. 11A-B, items 510, 512, 516, 518; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
 - if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes while *Newton et al* teaches,
- providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

Art Unit: 2121

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* for the purpose of improving security.

Regarding claims 40-41, 44-48:

Claims 40-41 and 44-48 are rejected for being dependent on the above rejected independent claim 28 and for reasons given in the prior office action.

Regarding claim 49:

Feinberg teaches,

- a computer readable program code module to determine whether a prospective access code is among a group of associated access codes, and whether a prospective password is among a group of associated passwords, wherein at least one of the associated access codes corresponds to the patient, and wherein at least one of the associated passwords corresponds to an entity that is not the patient (Fig. 2, item 58; Fig. 5, item 52; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- a computer readable program code module to provide medical information corresponding to the prospective access code and the prospective password, if the prospective access code is among the group of associated access codes and the prospective password is among the group of associated passwords (Fig. 2, items 11,

38, 58; Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is among the group of associated access codes and the prospective password is among the group of associated passwords while *Newton et al* teaches, - providing description(s) if the prospective access code is among the group of associated access codes and the prospective password is among the group of associated passwords (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Motivation – The portions of the claimed article of manufacture would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* for the purpose of improving security.

Regarding claim 52:

The rejection of claim 52 is similar to that for claim 28 as recited above since the stated limitations of the claim are set forth in the reference(s). Claim 52's limitations difference is taught in *Feinberg*:

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to provide a message to a user related to an associated access code when the description is provided to someone other than the user (Figs. 2, 6; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5")

Newton et al:

- a computer readable program code module to instruct a computer to provide a message to a user related to an associated access code (Fig. 1)

Claims 6-7, 17-18, 32-33 and 42-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Feinberg* in view of *Newton et al* and in further view of *Corcoran et al* "Smart Cards and Biometrics: Your Key to PK1" (March 1999).

Regarding claim 6:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the each associated pair comprising an associated access code, which is associated with the patient, and an associated password, which is associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

Art Unit: 2121

- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code, which is associated with a patient, and a prospective password, which is associated with a user of the system (Fig. 2, item 54; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- a second computer, in communication with the database and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 5, items 52, 54; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs or fingerprint passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step ... encryption key codes")

Corcoran et al teaches,

- the prospective password is a fingerprint (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Art Unit: 2121

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, “the new and improved ...to be readily employed”)
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, “Integrating smart cards... applications and communications”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 7:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the each associated pair comprising an associated access code, which is associated with the patient, and an associated password, which is associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”; column 7, lines 15-19, “The translator program ... or the patient 5”; column 7, lines 47-59, “The medical services ... that describe patient 5”; column 21, lines 7-11, “The bitstream is ... protection, as well”)

Art Unit: 2121

- a first computer programmed to provide a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code, which is associated with a patient, and a prospective password, which is associated with a user of the system (Fig. 2, item 54; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- a second computer, in communication with the database and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether a prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs, and if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 5, items 52, 54; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs or retinal scan passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step ... encryption key codes")

Corcoran et al teaches,

- the prospective password is a retinal scan (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, “the new and improved ...to be readily employed”)
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, “Integrating smart cards... applications and communications”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 17:

Feinberg teaches,

- providing a computer database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the each associated pair comprising an associated access code, which is associated with the patient, and an associated password, which is associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”; column 7, lines 15-19, “The translator program ... or the patient 5”; column 7, lines 47-59, “The medical services ... that describe patient 5”; column 21, lines 7-11, “The bitstream is ... protection, as well”)

Art Unit: 2121

- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code, which is associated with a patient, and a prospective password, which is associated with a user of the system (Fig. 2, item 54; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs; if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs or fingerprint passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes")

Corcoran et al teaches,

- reading a fingerprint having thereon a pattern corresponding to the prospective password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

Art Unit: 2121

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, "Integrating smart cards... applications and communications")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 18:

Feinberg teaches,

- providing a computer database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated pair, the each associated pair comprising an associated access code, which is associated with the patient, and an associated password, which is associated with a user of the system, wherein users of the system include an entity other than patients (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- receiving a prospective pair, the prospective pair comprising a prospective access code, which is associated with a patient, and a prospective password, which is

Art Unit: 2121

associated with a user of the system (Fig. 2, item 54; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- determining whether the prospective pair corresponds to one of the associated pairs; if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective pair (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs or retina passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective pair is determined to correspond to one of the associated pairs (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes")

Corcoran et al teaches,

- reading a retina having thereon a pattern corresponding to the prospective password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")

Art Unit: 2121

- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, "Integrating smart cards... applications and communications")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 32:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code, wherein acceptable passwords corresponding to users of the system, and wherein at least one of the acceptable passwords corresponds to an entity other than the patient (Fig. 2, item 10; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 6-12, "The computer system ... of the data"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ...

Art Unit: 2121

that describe patient 5"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")

- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether of the associated the prospective access code corresponds to one access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 5, items 52, 54; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes or fingerprint passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Corcoran et al teaches,

- the prospective password is a fingerprint (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, “the new and improved ...to be readily employed”)
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, “Integrating smart cards...applications and communications”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 33:

Feinberg teaches,

- a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”; column 7, lines 15-19, “The translator program ... or the patient 5”; column 21, lines 7-11, “The bitstream is ... protection, as well”)
- a card having thereon a first computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code, wherein acceptable passwords corresponding to users of the system, and wherein at least one of the acceptable passwords corresponds to an entity other than the patient (Fig. 2, item 10; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”; column 7, lines 6-12, “The computer system ... of the data”; column 7, lines 15-19, “The

Art Unit: 2121

translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")

- a second computer, in communication with the data base and with the first computer, the second computer being programmed to determine whether of the associated the prospective access code corresponds to one access codes, and if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then the second computer provides the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 5, items 52, 54; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 7, lines 15-44, "The translator program...the card code"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes or retina passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Corcoran et al teaches,

- the prospective password is a retina (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed system would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

Art Unit: 2121

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, “the new and improved ...to be readily employed”)
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, “Integrating smart cards...applications and communications”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 42:

Feinberg teaches,

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code, wherein the associated access code corresponds to the patient (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”; column 7, lines 15-19, “The translator program ... or the patient 5”; column 21, lines 7-11, “The bitstream is ... protection, as well”)
- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, “Special cards, usually...remote computer databases”; column 7, lines 6-12, “The computer system ... of the data”; column 7, lines 15-19, “The translator program ... or the patient 5”; column 20, lines 63-67, “The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area”; column 21, lines 1-11, “date card 10...protection, as well”)

Art Unit: 2121

- providing a password (Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
 - determining whether the password is among a group of acceptable passwords, at least one of the passwords being associated with an entity other than the patient (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5")
 - providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
 - determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Figs. 11A-B, items 510, 512, 516, 518; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
 - if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes or fingerprint passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

Art Unit: 2121

- providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Corcoran et al teaches,

- providing a password includes providing a fingerprint having thereon a pattern corresponding to the password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements... is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, "Integrating smart cards... applications and communications")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

Regarding claim 43:

Feinberg teaches,

- providing a database of health information descriptions, each description relating to a patient and an associated access code, wherein the associated access code

Art Unit: 2121

corresponds to the patient (Fig. 2, item 100; Fig. 6; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

- providing a card capable of providing a prospective access code (Fig. 2, item 10; Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 7, lines 6-12, "The computer system ... of the data"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
- providing a password (Fig. 11B, item 530; column 2, lines 50-56, "Special cards, usually...remote computer databases"; column 20, lines 63-67, "The ADMIN area...no.; geographic area"; column 21, lines 1-11, "date card 10...protection, as well")
- determining whether the password is among a group of acceptable passwords, at least one of the passwords being associated with an entity other than the patient (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 7, lines 15-19, "The translator program ... or the patient 5"; column 7, lines 47-59, "The medical services ... that describe patient 5")
- providing the prospective access code (Fig. 11B, item 530; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")
- determining whether the prospective access code corresponds to one of the associated access codes (Figs. 11A-B, items 510, 512, 516, 518; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

Art Unit: 2121

- if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes, then providing the description that corresponds to the prospective access code (Fig. 3, items 86, 88; Fig. 6; Figs. 11A-B; column 4, lines 26-37, "the invention features...to the caller"; column 21, lines 7-11, "The bitstream is ... protection, as well")

However, *Feinberg* doesn't explicitly teach providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes or retina passwords while *Newton et al* teaches,

- providing description(s) if the prospective access code is determined to correspond to one of the associated access codes (Fig. 1; column 2, lines 46-56, "The initial step... encryption key codes").

Corcoran et al teaches,

- providing a password includes providing a retina having thereon a pattern corresponding to the password (page 4, sentences 2-3, "Newer biometric measurements...is the fingerprint")

Motivation – The portions of the claimed method would have been a highly desirable feature in this art for

- Improving security (*Newton et al*, column 2, lines 35-46, "the new and improved ...to be readily employed")
- Developing secure applications and communications (*Corcoran et al*, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1, "Integrating smart cards...applications and communications")

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify *Feinberg* as taught by *Newton et al* and *Corcoran et al* for the purpose of improving security as well as developing secure applications and communications.

RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS' AMENDMENT REMARKS

Applicant(s) argue(s) that the amendment to claims 1, 13, 24, 28, 36, 39, 49 and 52 do not introduce new matter (Amendment REMARKS page 18, paragraph 3).

Oath/Declaration

Applicant(s) argue(s) that the new declaration includes the proper serial number for the provisional patent application misidentified in the originally filed declaration (Amendment REMARKS page 19, paragraph 1).

The examiner agrees that the new declaration includes the proper serial number for provisional patent application number 60/226,401 filed **8/18/00**. The new declaration has been entered.

Drawings

Applicant(s) argue(s) that the three Substitute Sheet drawings address the comments on the form PTO-948 included with the prior Office Action (Amendment REMARKS page 17, paragraph 1 and page 19, paragraph 2) and that the two Proposed

Art Unit: 2121

Substitute Sheet drawings respond to the comments provided at page 3 of the prior Office Action (Amendment REMARKS page 17, paragraph 2) without adding new matter (Amendment REMARKS page 19, paragraph 4 and page 20, paragraphs 1 and 3).

The Substitute Sheet and Proposed Substitute Sheet amendments to the drawings (Figs. 1-3 and 2-3, respectively) have been entered and examined. Though the examiner accepts the Substitute Sheet Figs. 1-3, it is noted that the conditional diamonds of the Proposed Substitute Sheet Figs. 2-3 are missing the No branch and item numbers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Applicant(s) argue(s) that claim 13 is directed to statutory subject matter (Amendment REMARKS page 21, paragraph 1) and amended claim 13 includes limitations proposed in the prior Office Action (Amendment REMARKS page 22, paragraph 4).

Though the examiner agrees claim 13 reflects limitations consistent with other claims in the subject application, it is still directed to non-statutory subject matter as recited in the above 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(e)

Applicant(s) argue(s) that the portions of Feinberg USPN 6,082,776 cited in the prior Office Action do not anticipate the associated pair, access code, password and

first computer combination/limitations of claims 1, 13 and/or 24 (Amendment REMARKS page 23, paragraphs 3-4 and page 24, paragraph 1).

Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 46-56 of Newton et al USPN 5,771,291 are cited for an explicit description of associated pair, access code, password and first computer encryption functionality stated also stated as well known in column 21, lines 8-10 of Feinberg. Consequently, claims 1, 13 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feinberg in view of Newton et al as recited above.

Applicant(s) argue(s) that Feinberg does not disclose limitations for the card of independent claim 28: 1) a computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code and 2) an acceptable password corresponds to an entity other than the patient (Amendment REMARKS page 24, paragraph 2).

Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 46-56 of Newton et al USPN 5,771,291 are cited for an explicit description of a computer programmed to require entry of a password prior to providing a prospective access code also stated as well known encryption functionality in column 21, lines 8-10 of Feinberg. Further, Feinberg discloses this computer as a microprocessor on a card in column 7, lines 9-12 and an acceptable password corresponds to an entity other than the patient in Fig. 2, column 7, lines 15-19 and column 21, lines 7-11. Consequently, claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feinberg in view of Newton et al as recited above.

Applicant(s) argue(s) that Feinberg does not disclose at least one of the passwords is associated with an entity other than the patient for the card of independent claim 39: (Amendment REMARKS page 24, paragraph 3).

Feinberg discloses at least one of the passwords is associated with an entity other than the patient for the card of independent claim 39 in Fig. 2, column 7, lines 9-12, column 7, lines 15-19 and column 21, lines 7-11. Consequently, claim 39 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feinberg in view of Newton et al as recited above.

Applicant(s) argue(s) that Feinberg does not disclose the card of independent claim 49: 1) an associated password corresponding to an entity that is not the patient and 2) a program code module wherein medical information is caused to be provided if a prospective access code is among a group of associated access codes and a prospective password is among a group of associated passwords (Amendment REMARKS page 24, paragraph 4 and page 25, paragraph 1).

Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 46-56 of Newton et al USPN 5,771,291 are cited for an explicit description of what Feinberg also states as well known encryption functionality in column 21, lines 8-10: a program code module wherein medical information is caused to be provided if a prospective access code is among a group of associated access codes and a prospective password is among a group of associated passwords. Further, Feinberg discloses this computer as a microprocessor on a card in column 7, lines 9-12 and an associated password corresponding to an entity that is not the patient in Fig. 2, column 7, lines 15-19 and column 21, lines 7-11. Consequently, claim 49 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Feinberg in view of Newton et al as recited above.

Art Unit: 2121

Applicant(s) argue(s) that claims 2-5, 8, 12, 14-16, 19, 23, 25-27, 34, 38, 40-41, 44, 48 and 50-52 are allowable for depending on the independent claims (Amendment REMARKS page 25, paragraph 2).

The examiner disagrees and has rejected claims 2-5, 8, 12, 14-16, 19, 23, 25-27, 34, 38, 40-41, 44, 48 and 50-52 for being dependent on rejected independent claims and for reasons given in the prior Office Action.

As set forth above with regards to Feinberg and Newton et al, the items listed explicitly and inherently teach each element of the applicants' claimed limitations. Applicants have not set forth any distinction or offered any dispute between the claims of the subject application, Feinberg's Storing personal medical information and Newton et al's User identification and authentication system using ultra long identification keys and ultra large databases of identification keys for secure remote terminal access to a host computer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Applicant(s) argue(s) that Newton et al and an article by Corcoran et al titled *Smart Cards and Biometrics* do not make up for the deficiencies of Feinberg in regards to claims 6-7, 9-11, 17-18, 20-22, 32-33, 35-37, 42-43 and 45-47 (Amendment REMARKS page 25, paragraph 3 and page 26, paragraph 1).

Applicants' claims 6-7, 9-11, 17-18, 20-22, 32-33, 35-37, 42-43 and 45-47 arguments are not agreed with for reasons recited above and in the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1-52: 1) Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 46-56 of Newton et al for the one

Art Unit: 2121

of the associated pairs is related to a plurality of descriptions and an explicit description of associated pair, access code, password and first computer encryption functionality stated as well known in column 21, lines 8-10 of Feinberg, 2) Figs. 2, 6, 11A-B as well as column 7, lines 9-12, column 7, lines 15-19 and column 21, lines 7-11 of Feinberg for a computer as a microprocessor on a card, an acceptable password corresponds to an entity other than the patient, one of the associated access codes is issued to a health care provider, and the one of the associated access codes is related to a plurality of descriptions and 3) page 4, sentences 2-3 of Corcoran et al for fingerprint and retina passwords. Furthermore, the motivation for combining the references include developing secure applications and communications (Corcoran et al, page 7, Conclusion section, sentence 1) and improving security (Newton et al, column 2, lines 35-46).

As set forth above with regards to Feinberg, Newton et al and Corcoran et al, the items listed explicitly and inherently teach each element of the applicants' claimed limitations. Applicants have not set forth any distinction or offered any dispute between the claims of the subject application, Feinberg's Storing personal medical information, Newton et al's User identification and authentication system using ultra long identification keys and ultra large databases of identification keys for secure remote terminal access to a host computer and Corcoran et al's *Smart Cards and Biometrics*.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Office should be directed to Melvin Bell whose telephone number is 703-305-0362. This Examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 7:30 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach this Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, his supervisor, Anthony Knight, can be reached on 703-308-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

MB / M.U.

Ramesh Patel
RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER 7/29/04
For Anthony Knight